

Two-dimensional conformal field theory and beyond. Lessons from a continuing fashion*

I. T. Todorov [†]

Laboratorio Interdisciplinare per le Scienze Naturali e Umanistiche,
SISSA-ISAS, via Beirut 2-4, I-34014 Trieste, Italy

Abstract

Two-dimensional conformal field theory (CFT) has several sources: the search for simple examples of quantum field theory, the description of surface critical phenomena, the study of (super)string vacua.

In the present overview of the subject we emphasize the role of CFT in bridging the gap between mathematics and quantum field theory and discuss some new physical concepts that emerged in the study of CFT models: anomalous dimensions, rational CFT, braid group statistics.

In an aside, at the end of the paper, we share the misgivings, recently expressed by Penrose, about some dominant trends in fundamental theoretical physics.

1 Introduction. Reconciling mathematics and physics

Two-dimensional conformal field theory ($2D$ CFT) has been with us for over 30 years. It became a main stream topic since the breakthrough 1984 paper of Belavin, Polyakov and Zamolodchikov [1]. The present overview, addressed to a broad audience, deals with some general aspects of this development. We offer a (necessarily subjective) answer to the question: what should a theoretical physicist or mathematician interested in quantum field theory (QFT) retain from it?

*Subject of a Colloquium talk at the International School for Advanced Studies (SISSA), Trieste, December 1999 and of an Invited Lecture at the 4th General Conference of the Balkan Physical Union, Veliko Turnovo, Bulgaria, 22-25 August, 2000

[†]On leave of absence from the Institute for Nuclear Research and Nuclear Energy, Tsarigradsko Chaussee 72, BG-1784 Sofia, Bulgaria; e-mail: toodorov@inrne.bas.bg

It seems appropriate to begin with the role $2D$ CFT is playing in bridging the gap between mathematics and QFT¹. First, some general remarks about the affair between mathematics and physics.

Archimedes, one of the greatest mathematicians of antiquity, also was the greatest physicist of his time. Newton, the founder of modern physics, created on the way the calculus. After him, classical mechanics was developed by mathematicians: Euler, Lagrange, Poisson, Hamilton, Jacobi.... The separation between mathematics and (theoretical) physics only took place during the 19th century, accompanying the creation of classical electrodynamics. Still, in the first quarter of the 20th century mathematicians and physicists could compete on a common ground. The three revolutions of the "golden age in physics" were made easier by preceding developments in mathematics: Poincaré, following the work of Lorentz, anticipated the creation of special relativity (see, e.g., [6]); Einstein's theory of gravity was based on Riemannian geometry (and the action giving rise to the correct general relativistic equations of motion was written down by Hilbert [7]); if quantum mechanics – in the form which Dirac gave to it – was gradually understood as a deformation of classical mechanics – see [8] and references therein, this was made possible by the preceding mathematical development of the Hamiltonian formalism. Stone-von Neumann theory of operators in a Hilbert space was stimulated by – and serves as language of – quantum mechanics.

In the words of Nahm [2] "a theoretical physicist who looks back to the beginning of the past century has reasons to be humble". Indeed, the remaining three quarters of the 20th century were devoted to a not fully successful effort to combine two of these revolutions, special relativity and quantum mechanics, into quantum field theory. (Well in line with Michael Atiyah's observation that when a theoretical physicist can not solve a problem he goes for the next more difficult one, in the past 20 years many of us are daydreaming to put together quantum mechanics and general relativity in a "quantum gravity" within (super)string theory.) Perhaps, the relatively slow progress in quantum field theory (as compared to quantum mechanics) can be accounted for by the fact that classical field theory, the dynamics of a system with infinitely many degrees of freedom, has not undergone the same type of mathematical elaboration (and has not reached the same level of maturity) as classical mechanics.

In fact, it is probably not an accident that the parting of ways between mathematics and physics roughly coincided with the first attempts to create quantum electrodynamics in the late twenties. Freeman Dyson was hardly exaggerating when, in his 1972 address to the American Mathematical Society, he deplored the divorce between mathematics and physics over the issue of quantum field theory.

The reasons for such an alienation were multifold. Even during the years of relative harmony, in the beginning of the century, physicists did not appear to

¹A source of inspiration for me in this respect has been the essay of Werner Nahm [2]. It belongs to one of a number of collections of reflections on physics and mathematics at the turn of the century (see also [3]-[5]).

appreciate "pure mathematics". Mittag-Leffler failed, in spite of his efforts, to get a Nobel prize for Poincaré (see [9]). Later, in the words of Res Jost, "...under the demoralizing influence of quantum field theoretic perturbation theory [infested with divergences], the mathematics required for a theoretical physicist was reduced to a rudimentary knowledge of the Latin and Greek alphabet." The attempt of axiomatic field theory to establish some order in the domain were met with contempt by "main stream" theorists. Mathematics, on the other hand, had an inward development personified by Bourbaki. Two leaders of the group, André Weil and Jean Dieudonné, ventured to affirm that XX century mathematics would not suffer the influence of physics ².

Signs of a changing attitude, on both sides of the fence, started to be visible in the 1950's. A new brand of mathematical physicists (Bogolubov, Faddeev, Haag, Kastler, Wightman – to name a few) tried to translate the problems of QFT into a proper mathematical language. The task was not easy. In fundamental physics to ask the right question you need to anticipate the answer. The problems of QFT are very hard indeed. When a mathematician is confronted with an unmanageable problem he looks for a simpler one of a similar nature that may help him gain some insight. Among physicists such an attitude is often viewed with disrespect. It took some 12 years before the first interesting example of a 2D QFT (Thirring 1958 [10]; see also [11]) originally proposed as a toy model for the then popular Heisenberg's 4-fermion "Urmaterie" theory, was truly appreciated and put to use by theorists. Physicists in the 1960's were working hard on 4-dimensional current algebras, a subject which has yet to become a mathematical theory, neglecting to look first at the much simpler 2-dimensional case. It was not until 1972 (see [12]) that the current algebra inherent to the Thirring model was made explicit (5 years after Kac and Moody discovered their non-abelian current algebras). In the 60's [10] was not cited in the quite extensive bibliography of Schweber's "Introduction to Relativistic Quantum Field Theory", 1964 – not even in Thirring's own book with Henley ("Elementary Quantum Field Theory", 1962); a notable exception: former Schwinger's student K. Johnson devoted a paper to the model in 1961 (it was he who taught it later to K. Wilson).

For a time there were independent parallel developments in mathematics and physics (connections on fiber bundles - Yang-Mills gauge fields, Kac-Moody algebras - current algebras, Atiyah-Singer index theory - Adler-Bell-Jackiw anomalies).

Meanwhile, physicists got a better excuse to study 2D CFT: it was realized [13] that the critical Ising model is described by a simple conformally invariant euclidean QFT (it has been gradually understood – starting with a 1953 paper by Abdus Salam on super-conductivity – that euclidean QFT can serve the description of statistical mechanics and condensed matter systems). By that time string theory has made its appearance (yet as a theory of strong interaction) and it was recognized (by A. Galli in 1970) that 2D CFT is an essential ingredi-

²Cited by Pierre Cartier in "André Weil (1906-1998): adieu à un ami", Séminaire de Philosophie et de Mathématiques, École Normale Supérieure, 1998

ent. The ground was prepared for a renewed interaction between mathematicians and physicists. Near the end of the century it resulted in an express effort by mathematicians to learn QFT [14].

2 What are we learning from 2D CFT?

2.1 Anomalous dimensions

Equal time canonical (anti)commutation relations, $[\varphi(t, \mathbf{x}), \varphi(t, \mathbf{y})] = i\delta(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y})$ for a neutral scalar field, $[\psi^*(t, \mathbf{x}), \psi(t, \mathbf{y})]_+ = \delta(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y})$ for a Weyl spinor field, determine the corresponding dimensions as $\frac{D-2}{2}$ for a scalar field, $\frac{D-1}{2}$ for a spin $\frac{1}{2}$ field. The very formulation of these relations requires the existence of sharp time smeared fields, $\psi(t, f) = \int \psi(t, \xi) f(\xi) d\xi$, $[\psi(t, f)^*, \psi(t, f)]_+ = \int |f(\xi)|^2 d\xi$; here f is a (smooth, falling at infinity) test function.

This property is questioned by axiomatic field theory. Haag's work of 1955 led to the understanding that interacting fields can not be viewed as a sharp time operator valued distributions (in the sense of Schwartz): one also needs smearing in the time variable. This is a manifestation of the subtleties inherent in infinite dimensional systems. In quantum mechanics of a system with a finite number of degrees of freedom the canonical commutation relations $[q_j, p_k] = i\delta_{jk}$ are maintained in an interacting theory. Physicists tend not to believe in mathematical subtleties unless they are forced to, so they ignored for a time Haag's theorem. (Gelfand used to say that a physicist's behaviour towards mathematics is similar to the attitude of an intelligent thief towards the criminal law: he studies it just as necessary to avoid punishment.) The punishment came from 2D CFT models. Anomalous dimensions had to be discovered twice before being taken seriously by the QFT community: first, they appeared in the critical Ising model of a 2D spin system (Onsager, 1944, interpreted in QFT terms in [13]) in which the magnetization (scalar) field $\sigma(x)$ has dimension $\frac{1}{8}$; secondly, they were present from the outset in the Thirring model [10] but only entered mainstream QFT when identified by Wilson [15] in his study of operator product expansions. There, the anomalous dimension of the basic field ψ (of canonical dimension $(\frac{1}{2}, 0)$) is proportional to the square of the coupling constant. For those who suspected that it was a peculiar 2D effect, recent work on $N = 4$ (extended) super-symmetric Yang-Mills theory [16, 17] demonstrates its relevance in conformally invariant 4D QFT as well.

2.2 RCFT (Rational Conformal Field Theories)

Schroer, 1974, and Lüscher and Mack, 1976, realized that Wightman axioms plus scale invariance and the existence of a (traceless) stress-energy tensor T imply the Virasoro algebra Vir for the modes L_n of the chiral component of T :

$$T(z) = \sum L_n z^{-n-2}, \quad [L_n, L_m] = (n-m)L_{n+m} + \frac{n(n^2-1)}{12} c \delta_{n,-m}. \quad (1)$$

Mack and Lüscher, in their famous unpublished paper of 1976, further demonstrated that the smallest positive value of the central charge c for which the representation of Vir is unitary is $c = \frac{1}{2}$ and that there is a gap between $c = \frac{1}{2}$ and the next (bigger) unitary value of c . This was a rare moment when further progress in physics had to wait for a substantial development in mathematics and such a development did come 3 years later with the computation of Kac determinant [18]. It took another 5 years (and the help of two mathematicians, Feigin and Fuchs) for physicists to digest this result before the appearance of, perhaps, the most important paper in the field, [1]. The authors found that for each of the series of values of the central charge $c = c_{p,p'} = 1 - 6\frac{(p-p')^2}{pp'}$, p, p' – coprime positive integers, there is a finite set $(\Delta_{r,s}(p, p'))$ of rational conformal dimensions (integer multiples of $\frac{1}{4pp'}$) for which the Kac determinant vanishes, such that the corresponding primary conformal fields $\phi_{r,s}$ span an operator product algebra. In other words, for each pair (p, p') of different positive integers one defines an RCFT – i.e., a 2D CFT with a finite number of super-selection sectors with ground states labeled by $c_{p,p'}$ and $\Delta_{r,s}(p, p')$. The next step was to demonstrate [19] that the subset of RCFT with $p' = p+1$, $\Delta_{r,s} = \frac{[(p+1)r-ps]^2-1}{4p(p+1)}$, $1 \leq r \leq p-1$, $1 \leq s \leq p$, $p = 3, 4, \dots$ ($r-s$ even) exhaust the unitary minimal models (and in fact, all unitary irreducible representations of Vir with $c < 1$). It gave rise to a general study of RCFT which, for $c > 1$, is still not complete. (For a review of the subject including a proof of Lüscher-Mack theorem – see [20]. Gawedzki's lectures in [14] provide a recent survey oriented towards mathematicians.)

There are several reasons making RCFT interesting.

- (i) It provides a non-trivial family of theories with a finite number of super-selection sectors. These include not only QFT with finite gauge group (of the first kind) – cf. [21], but also theories which do not fit in the Doplicher-Roberts framework [22] and whose understanding requires a generalization of the concept of group (e.g., a quantum matrix algebra at a root of unity – see [23] and references therein).
- (ii) They give rise to rational conformal dimensions and quantized charges which may serve to describe observed excitation of fractional quantum Hall plateaux (see, e.g., Fröhlich and Pedrini in [5] and references therein).
- (iii) Vacuum expectation values of local observable fields are rational functions of the space-time coordinates, a property which may be also relevant for 4-dimensional CFT – see [24].

One may speculate that RCFT suggests a pattern that could explain observed charge quantization in a realistic QFT.

2.3 Braid group statistics

It took a surprisingly long time after the first quantum – Bose and Fermi – statistics were discovered before the possibility for more general statistics was realized.

The symmetry of an 1-component wave function $\psi(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ is described by either of the 1-dimensional representations of the group S_n of permutations giving rise to Bose and Fermi statistics. Particles with internal quantum numbers have multi-component wave functions that may transform under higher dimensional irreducible representations (IR) of S_n . It was proven by Doplicher and Roberts [22] in 1990, within Haag's algebraic approach to local quantum theory [25], that for $D = 4$ (or higher) space-time dimensions these are the most general possibilities (at least in the absence of massless particles); moreover, the symmetry and the composition law of super-selection sectors is governed by a compact gauge group of the first kind and the tensor product decomposition of its IR. The simple observation that in a $2D$ space, say in the complex plane, the manifold of non-coinciding points, $Y_n = ((z_1, \dots, z_n \in C^n; i \neq j \implies z_i \neq z_j))$ is not simply connected suggests that the wave function $\psi(z_1, \dots, z_n)$ may be multivalued and correspond to a braid group statistics. This observation has made its way in the physics literature in several instalments [26, 27, 28]. Braid group statistics are indeed realized in $2D$ CFT (the place of wave functions being taken by CFT correlation functions) – the reader will find a systematic exposition and further references in [29]; for a brief overview – see Sec.1 of [30]. This is not just a theoretical curiosity: anyon statistics – corresponding to one dimensional representations of the braid group – is realized by quasi-particles in the fractional quantum Hall effect (for a recent survey and references to original work – see, e.g., Fröhlich and Pedrini in [5]). Non-abelian braid group statistics have been also proposed (see [31, 32] and references therein) for some exotic quantum Hall fluids (corresponding to second Landau level states).

To sum up: even ignoring (as we did so far) the most popular appearance of $2D$ CFT – its more speculative application to string theory – we see that it is important as

- a field of common interest, a cross-point, for physicists and mathematicians;
- a source and a test-ground for new concepts in QFT;
- the main tool for describing the universality classes of $2D$ critical phenomena.

The present overview being rather one-sided (even within the stated restrictions) a newly interested reader is addressed to [33] that appears as a standard text-book on $2D$ CFT.

3 A new set of values in mathematical physics?

In a sense, the gap between mathematics and physics has been bridged too well: a new brand of mathematical physics has emerged with little or no empirical ground. Happily, this had led to important new insights in problems of pure

mathematics (vertex algebras [34]; knot invariants, low dimensional topology, mirror manifolds – for a sample of early accounts of these developments, see [35, 36, 37]). It is a common place to say that mathematics is applied to physics. A flow of applications of physical ideas to inciting a breakthrough in long standing mathematical problems is a novel phenomenon. It provides a *raison d'être* to the bold attempt to achieve an ultimate synthesis of quantum theory and gravity which has so far no phenomenological implications. But is it enough to justify a monopoly of string theory at the front line of theoretical physics? At this point I am inclined to share the reservations expressed by Roger Penrose [38] who suggests that the internet/e-mail revolution in communications helps impose everywhere the dominant trends of fundamental physics even in cases (he cites supersymmetry and inflation theory) in which these trends have no observational basis. In fact, a closer look may cast doubt on some of the pretenses of string theory as far as its applications to pure mathematics go. For instance, the first step in discovering new knot invariants was made by V. Jones (see the articles of Birman and Jones in [35]) as an outgrowth of his study of subfactors (a factor is a von Neumann algebra with a trivial center). Or, this work was stimulated by the Haag-Kastler "algebraic" approach to local quantum physics (see [25]), an approach that never enjoyed the popularity of string theory.

String theory used to be advertised as a theory free of divergences. Divergences, however, reappeared in it together with the appearance of higher dimensional objects ("branes"). On the other hand, the renormalization program of good old quantum field theory acquired respectability in the hands of Connes and Kreimer (see [39] and references to earlier work cited there) who related it to a Hopf algebra structure inherent to non-commutative geometry and to the Riemann-Hilbert problem.

The D -branes serve as a tool to establish relations among the five consistent superstring theories in 10 dimensions suggesting the existence of a single parent theory. No clue is given, however, how to select the ground state, the "string vacuum". This leaves us with a vast variety of models thus rendering the uniqueness claim rather academic.

The strive for an all embracing fundamental theory is as old as natural philosophy and has been motivating the greatest physicists of all times. But, if the skepticism accompanying Einstein's solitary efforts to create a "unitary theory" may have been somewhat shortsighted, the show of euphoria at each new turn of string theory is hardly more justified. Now, string theory has borrowed some of the ideas of Einstein's time: the Kaluza-Klein compactification, the role of a skewsymmetric " B -field" in the geometry of space-time (in his last attempt to construct a unified field theory Einstein has used a metric $g_{\mu\nu}$ with an antisymmetric part). It does have a healthy mutually beneficial contact with modern mathematics. (As we have seen, there are other, much less fashionable branches of QFT, which share this quality.) What is not healthy is to claim a monopoly on fundamental theoretical developments. It is becoming increasingly difficult for a student of QFT to find a decent job unless he is following the latest fad in string theory. No doubt, it would be even more stupid to try to forbid su-

perstrings. Will scientists and science managers be wise enough to avoid this everything-or-nothing attitude, and not put all their eggs in a single basket?

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank Boris Dubrovin and Stefano Fantoni for their invitation and hospitality at the Laboratorio Interdisciplinare per le Scienze Naturali e Umanistiche at SISSA where this lecture was first presented. I thank Werner Nahm for providing me with a copy of his stimulating paper [2] prior to publication. My thanks also go to S. Yazadjiev who produced a usable file out of my handwritten notes and to L. Hadjiivanov for a careful reading of the manuscript.

The author acknowledges partial support from the Bulgarian National Council for Scientific Research under contract F-828.

References

- [1] A.A. Belavin, A.M. Polyakov, A.B. Zamolodchikov, Infinite conformal symmetry in two-dimensional quantum field theory, *Nucl. Phys.* **241** (1984) 333-380
- [2] W. Nahm, Conformal field theory: a bridge over troubled waters, in: *Quantum Field Theory - A Twentieth Century Profile*, Ed. A. N. Mitra, Hindustani Book Agency and Indian National Science Academy, 2000, pp. 571-604
- [3] *Mathematical Physics Towards the 21th Century*, Eds. R. N. Sen, A. Gersten, Ben-Gurion Univ. of the Negev Press, 1994; see, in particular, I.T. Todorov, What are we learning from 2-dimensional conformal models?, pp. 160-176
- [4] *Les Relations Entre les Mathématiques et la Physique Théorique*, Festschrift for the 40th anniversary of the IHES, Institut des Hautes Etudes Scientifiques, Le Bois-Marie - 91440 Bures-sur-Yvette, 1998; see, in particular P. Cartier, La folle journée, de Grothendieck à Connes et Kontsevich, Evolution des notions d'espace et de symétrie, pp 23-49, and L. Faddeev, A mathematician's view of the development of physics, pp. 73-79
- [5] *Mathematical Physics 2000*, Eds. A. Fokas, A. Grigoryan, T. Kibble, B. Zegarlinski, Imperial College Press, 2000; see, in particular, J. Fröhlich, B. Pedrini, New applications of chiral anomaly, pp. 9-47
- [6] H. Poincaré, The present and future of mathematical physics, Address at the Section of Applied Mathematics of the International Congress of Arts and Science, St. Louis, September 1904; reprinted in: *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* **37** (2000) 25-38

- [7] I. T. Todorov, Einstein and Hilbert: the creation of general relativity, Colloquium talk at the International Centre for Theoretical Physics, ICTP, Trieste preprint IC/92/421(translated in: The World of Physics **2** (1996) 68-77, in Bulgarian)
- [8] M. Kontsevich, Deformation quantization of Poisson manifolds I, [q-alg/9709040](#); Operads and motives in deformation quantization, Lett. Math. Phys. **48** (1999) 35-72
- [9] Ph. Nabonand, The Poincaré - Mittag-Leffler relationship, Mathematical Intelligencer **21**: 2 (1999) 58-63
- [10] W. Thirring, A soluble relativistic field theory, Ann. of Phys. **3** (1958) 91-112
- [11] N. Ilieva, W. Thirring, The Thirring model 40 years later, in: *Problems of QFT*, Eds. B.M. Barbashov, G.V. Efimov, A.V. Efremov, E2-99-35, JINR, Dubna 1999, pp. 167-183; [hep-th/9808118](#)
- [12] G.F. Dell'Antonio, Y. Frishman, D. Zwanziger, Thirring model in terms of currents: solution and light cone expansion, Phys. Rev. **D6** (1972) 988-1007
- [13] L.P. Kadanoff, Operator algebra and the determination of critical indices, Phys. Rev. Lett. **23** (1969) 1430-1433
- [14] *Quantum Fields and Strings : A Course for Mathematicians*, Vols 1,2, Eds. P. Deligne et al, American Mathematical Society, Institute for Advanced Study, 1999; see, in particular, K. Gawędzki, Lectures on conformal field theory, Vol 2, pp. 727-805
- [15] K.G. Wilson, Operator product expansions and anomalous dimensions in the Thirring model, Phys. Rev. **D2** (1970) 1473-1477
- [16] B. Eden, P. S. Howe, C. Schubert, E. Sokatchev, P. C. West, Four-point functions in $N = 4$ supersymmetric Yang-Mills theory at two loops, Nucl. Phys. **B557** (1999) 355-379, [hep-th/9811172](#); Extremal correlators in four-dimensional SCFT, Phys. Lett. **B472** (2000) 323-331, [hep-th/9910150](#)
- [17] M. Bianchi, S. Kovacs, G. Rossi, Ya.S. Stanev, On the logarithmic behaviour of $N = 4$ SYM theory, J. High Energy Phys. **08** (1999) 020, [hep-th/9906188](#); Anomalous dimensions in $N = 4$ SYM theory at order g^4 , Nucl. Phys. **B584** (2000) 216-232
- [18] V.G. Kac, Contravariant form for infinite dimensional Lie algebras and superalgebras, in: Lecture Notes in Physics **94**, Springer, Berlin et al, 1979, pp. 441-445
- [19] D. Friedan, Z. Qiu, S. Schenker, Conformal invariance, unitarity and critical exponents in two dimensions, Phys. Rev. Lett. **52** (1984) 1575-1578; Details of the non-unitarity proof for highest weight representations of the Virasoro algebra, Commun. Math. Phys. **107** (1986) 535-542

- [20] P. Furlan, G.M. Sotkov, I.T. Todorov, Two-dimensional conformal quantum field theory, Riv. Nuovo Cim. **12**:6 (1989) 1-202
- [21] D. Buchholz, G. Mack, I.T. Todorov, The current algebra on the circle as a germ of local field theories, Nucl. Phys. B (Proc. Suppl.) **5B** (1988) 20-56
- [22] S. Doplicher, J.E. Roberts, Why there is a field algebra with a compact gauge group describing the super-selection structure in particle physics, Commun. Math. Phys. **131** (1990) 51-107
- [23] P. Furlan, L.K. Hadjiivanov, A.P. Isaev, O.V. Ogievetsky, P.N. Pyatov, I.T. Todorov, Quantum matrix algebra for the $SU(n)$ WZNW model, hep-th/0003210
- [24] N.M. Nikolov, I.T. Todorov, Rationality of conformally invariant local correlation functions on compactified Minkowski space, hep-th/0009004
- [25] R. Haag, *Local Quantum Physics. Fields, Particles, Algebras*, Springer 1992
- [26] M.H.A. Newman, On a string problem of Dirac, J. London Math. Soc. **17** (1942) 173-177
- [27] D. Finkelstein, J. Rubinstein, Connection between spin, statistics, and kinks, J. Math. Phys. **9** (1968) 1762-1779
- [28] J. M. Leinaas, J. Myrheim, On the theory of identical particles, Nuovo Cim. **37** (1977) 1-23
- [29] J. Fröhlich, F. Gabbiani, Braid statistics in local quantum theory, Rev. Math. Phys. **2** (1990) 251-353
- [30] I.T. Todorov, L.K. Hadjiivanov, Monodromy representations of the braid group, Invited talk by I.T. Todorov at the *XXIII International Colloquium on Group Theoretical Methods in Physics*, Dubna, July 31 - August 5, 2000 (to appear in the Proceedings)
- [31] A. Cappelli, L. S. Georgiev, I.T. Todorov, Coset construction of parafermionic Hall states, in: *Supersymmetries and Quantum Symmetries*, Proceedings of SQS99, Eds. E. Ivanov et al, Dubna, 2000, pp.235-247; Parafermion Hall states from coset projections of abelian conformal theories, hep-th/0009229
- [32] J. Fröhlich, B. Pedrini, Ch. Schweigert, J. Walcher, Universality in quantum Hall systems: coset construction of incompressible states, cond-mat/0002330
- [33] P. Di Francesco, P. Mathieu, D. Senechal, *Conformal Field Theory*, Springer 1997

- [34] R. E. Borcherds, Quantum vertex algebras, [math.QA/9903038](#);
P. Goddard, The work of R. E. Borcherds, in: *Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians*, Berlin 1998, [math.QA/9808136](#)
- [35] *Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians, Kyoto 1990*, The Math. Soc. of Japan, Springer, 1991; see, in particular, V.F.R. Jones, Von Neumann algebras in mathematics and physics, pp.121-138, K. Uhlenbeck, Applications of non-linear analysis in topology, pp. 261-279, A. Varchenko, Multidimensional hypergeometric functions in conformal field theory, algebraic K-theory, algebraic geometry, pp. 281-300
- [36] *Essays on Mirror Manifolds*, Ed. S.T. Yau, International Press, Hong Kong 1992
- [37] E. Witten, Monopoles and four-manifolds, *Math. Research Letters* **1** (1994) 769-796;
C.H. Taubes, The Seiberg-Witten invariants and the Gromov invariant, *Math. Research Letters* **2** (1995) 221-238
- [38] R. Penrose, How computers help – and hurt – scientific research, *Convergence*, Winter 1999, p. 30
- [39] A. Connes, D. Kreimer, Hopf algebras, renormalization and non-commutative geometry, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **199** (1998) 203; Renormalization in quantum field theory and the Riemann-Hilbert problem, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **210** (2000) 249 and [hep-th/0003188](#);
D. Kreimer, Combinatorics of (perturbative) quantum field theory, [hep-th/0010059](#)